



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,318	05/30/2000	Sandeep Kishan Singhal	BOC9-2000-0023/1759P	1555

7590 06/02/2003

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP
P O Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	2

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/583,318	SINGHAL ET AL.
	Examiner Quang N. Nguyen	Art Unit 2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Application No. 09/583,318 filed on 05/30/2000.

Claims 1-59 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. **Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.**

4. As to claims 2-3, the specification does not contain a written description of how to send/provide local weather, time and date as the environment information of the wireless device to a server on the communication network.

As best understood by the examiner, local weather information, time and date as the environment information of the wireless device would be sent/provided to the server by conventional request, i.e., manually inputting the word/phrase "RAIN, CLOUDY or SUNSHINE", etc... using the input means of the wireless device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-4, 7, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen et al. (US 6,014,090), herein after referred as Rosen, in view of King et al. (US 6,353,839), herein after referred as King.**

7. As to claims 1-3, Rosen teaches a method and system for delivering information to a wireless device over a communication network, comprising:

sending geographic location identifier (i.e., environment information as geographic location, local weather, date and time) of the wireless device to a server on the communication network (Rosen, C4: L59-67 and C5: L1-12);

receiving identifiers (URLs/network addresses) from the server of the web sites (associated resource servers providing information of potential interest) most likely to be requested by a user of the wireless device (Rosen, C5: L28-42 and C6: L5-11);

However, Rosen does not explicitly teach the step of caching the identifiers for selection by the user.

In the related art, King teaches a method and system for storing and accessing information using Handheld Device Markup Language (HDML) for mobile devices wherein the identifiers (i.e., URLs included in HDML decks) are stored as cached in RAM 134 of the mobile phone 120 of Fig. 2 (King, C5: L42-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rosen to include the step of caching the identifiers (URLs) for selection by the user to increase portability and mobility for thin-client devices as PDA, wireless/mobile devices with limiting computing resources to access information, Internet Web pages, over the communication network.

8. As to claim 4, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, including the step of personalizing which identifiers are pushed based on personalization information, i.e., user profile (Rosen, C5: L59-67 and C6: L1-11).

9. As to claim 7, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, further including the step of displaying the identifiers on the wireless device (via user interface device 133) for selection by the user (Rosen, C6: L5-11).

10. As to claim 9, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, wherein geographic location device can be a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver, which provides a geographic location identifier, based on the location of the mobile communication system through GPS satellite system so as long as the mobile communication device is turned on (or active) the geographic location identifier can be obtained and transmitted periodically to the telecommunication network (Rosen, C3: L7-31).

11. As to claim 10, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, further including the step of receiving URLs (WEB/resource server addresses) as the identifiers.

12. Claims 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-King as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Martin, Jr. et al. (US 6,363,419), herein after referred as Martin.

13. As to claim 5, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, but does not explicitly teaches the step of pre-fetching content from at least one of the web sites indicated by the identifiers.

In the related art, Martin teaches a method of pre-fetching the content information addressed by the URL (in the background by the browser) during a time the user last operated the browser so that the content information would always be immediately available for display to the user without requiring a network connection at idle time (Martin, C7: L60-67 and C8: L1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rosen-King to include the step of pre-fetching content from at least one of the web sites indicated by the identifiers (URLs) as suggested by Martin because it would allow the system to provide/display the content information that was cached in the mobile device at an earlier time to reduce the significant amounts of time to receive web data from URLs.

14. Claims 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-King as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Wynblatt et al. (US 6,219,696), herein after referred as Wynblatt.

15. As to claim 6, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, but does not explicitly teaches the step of informing the user that the identifiers (URLs) have been received.

In the related art, Wynblatt teaches a method and system for providing targeted internet information to mobile information terminal wherein the URL queue unit is a repository of URLs and title strings, made of standard digital memory and the URL queue unit may have a facility to alert (notify) the terminal user when a new URL has been received and is available (Wynblatt, C4: L28-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rosen-King to include the step of informing the user that the identifiers have been received as suggested by

Wynblatt because it would allow the system to provide information about traffic updates, weather, public emergency reports, advertisements, etc... for localized areas to users/motorists via WWW documents/sites accessed by received URLs.

16. Claims 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-King as applied in claim 1 above, in view of Shoji et al. (US 6,564,254), herein after referred as Shoji.

17. As to claim 8, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach the step of using the identifiers for lookahead data entry.

In the related art, Shoji teaches a method and system for specifying a location on a network by monitoring typed input (i.e., character or symbol) from the keyboard at the "Address:" or "Location:" field for entry of the site to be accessed by the WWW browser. If the input character/symbol is found in the cache file, all URLs corresponding to that character/symbol would be passed to the browser and displayed so as to allow the user to choose one URL therefrom (Shoji, C18: L35-67 and C19: L1-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rosen-King to include the step of using the identifiers for lookahead data entry as suggested by Shoji to provide user a simple and user-friendly process for specifying a location on a communications network.

18. Claims 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen-King as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Perrone et al. (US 6,157,705).

19. As to claim 11, Rosen-King teaches the method as in claim 1, but does not explicitly teach the step of receiving URL keywords as the identifiers for speech recognition.

In the related art, Perrone teaches a method for receiving the voice command, associating the voice command with a resource server based on the resource identifier, and delivering the resource from the remote server to the client (Perrone, C8: L9-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Rosen-King to include the step of receiving URL keywords as the identifiers for speech recognition as suggested by Perrone to provide the user a faster way to navigate through a conventional web site to reach desired information by a voice command.

20. Claims 12-23 are corresponding system claims of method claims 1-11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

21. Claims 24-35 are corresponding computer-readable medium claims of method claims 1-11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2141

22. Claims 36-43 are corresponding method claims of claims 1 and 5-11; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

23. Claims 44-51 are corresponding system claims of method claims 36-43; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

24. Claims 52-59 are corresponding computer-readable medium claims of method claims 36-43; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

25. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892, which is an attachment to this office action.


26. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire THREE (3) months from the mailing date of this communication. See 37 CFR 1.134.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8190.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's primary, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit, can be reached at (703) 305-9673. The fax phone numbers for the organization is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Quang N. Nguyen



A handwritten signature consisting of stylized initials 'B' and 'J' followed by a surname.

Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit